

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/819,731 03/29/2001		3/29/2001	Masayoshi Shimizu	826.1719	4353	
21171	7590 03/09/2004			EXAMI	EXAMINER	
STAAS & 1	HALSEY	LLP	DESIRE, GREGORY M			
SUITE 700 1201 NEW Y	YORK AV	ENUE, N.W.	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
WASHINGTON, DC 20005				2625	10	
			DATE MAILED: 03/09/2004	· \		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•		Application No.	Applicant(s)
	_	09/819,731	SHIMIZU ET AL.
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		Gregory M. Desire	2625
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence address
A SH THE   - Exter - If the - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  It period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	66(a). In no event, however, may a reply b within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) fill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS f cause the application to become ABANDX	e timely filed  days will be considered timely.  rom the mailing date of this communication.  DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status			•
1)⊠ 2a)⊟	, <del>, _</del> ,	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters,	
Disposit	ion of Claims		
5) □ 6) ⊠ 7) □ 8) □ Applicati	Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or ion Papers  The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on 29 March 2001 is/are:	vn from consideration. r election requirement. r.	d to by the Examiner.
11)	Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	ion is required if the drawing(s) is	objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority u	under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•	
a)i	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applic ity documents have been rece ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	cation No eived in this National Stage
2) Notic	te of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date 3.	4) Interview Summ Paper No(s)/Ma 5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:	

Art Unit: 2625

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-5, 7-12 and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima (6,701,011) in view of Yamakawa et al (5,809,366). Regarding claims 1, 8 and 15-18 Nakajima discloses,

A user preference obtaining unit outputting images at two or more correction levels as corrected images for a given image (note col. 19 lines 31-35, nine different adjustment patterns examiner interprets as two or more correction levels), and allowing a user to select a preferred corrected image (note col. 19 lines 35-48, user selects a preferred corrected image); and

Nakajima is silent disclosing an image correction unit correcting an image to be corrected, which is different from the given image based on a selection result from the user. However Nakajima teaches an image correction unit correcting an image to be corrected, which is different from the given image based on a selection result from the user (note fig. 3 block 10 in connection with col. 5 lines 60-65). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills to disclose an image correction unit correcting an image to be corrected, which is different from the given image based on a

Art Unit: 2625

selection result from the user. Nakajima creates a selection result from the user preference. Yamakawa in the same field of endeavor uses the selected results from the user to correct subsequent images, providing an accurate calibration that is standard in a system (note col. 2 lines 6-10).

Regarding claims 2 and 9 Nakajima and Yamakawa discloses,

Wherein said user preference obtaining unit outputs images at two or more correction levels corresponding to the plurality of given images to allow the user to select preferred corrected images (note Nakajima fig. 24a and 24b in connection with col. 20 lines 40-50). Nine thumbnail images correspond to the two or more correction levels and block 165 (scene) provides plurality of given images to allow the user to select preferred corrected images.

Regarding claims 3 and 10 Nakajima and Yamakawa discloses,

Wherein said plurality or given images are different in type (note Nakajima col. 20 lines 48-50, shows image different in type), and said user preference obtaining unit allows the user to selects preferred corrected image corresponding to each type (note Nakajima col. 20 line 44-47).

Regarding claims 4 and 12 Nakajima and Yamakawa discloses,

Art Unit: 2625

Wherein said given image is stored in advance in an image correction unit as an image of quality generally preferred by a large number of users (note Nakajima col. 20 line 18-20, lines cite image prepared beforehand).

Regarding claims 5 and 11 Nakajima and Yamakawa discloses,

A user specified image input unit receiving a user specified image as the given image (note Nakajima fig. 24b block 165 and col. 20 lines 40-45, sample is user specified image input unit receiving a use specified image).

Regarding claims 7 and 14 Nakajima and Yamakawa discloses,

Wherein said user preference obtaining unit prints and outputs images at two or more correction level (note Nakajima col. 19 lines 38-40, user prints nine images of different adjusting parameters (two or more correction levels); and

Apparatus further comprises an image-printing unit printing and outputting an image to be corrected, which has actually been corrected by said image correction unit (note Nakajima col. 19 lines 41-48).

3. Claims 6 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima and Yamakawa in further view of Kanno et al (6,577,761).

Regarding claims 6 and 13 Nakajima and Yamakawa are silent disclosing,

Wherein said user preference obtaining unit requests a user t input a user identifier for identification of the user, and allows each user to select a preferred

Art Unit: 2625

corrected image. However, Kanno discloses user inputs identifier and allows each user to select a preferred corrected image (note col. 12 lines 42-47 and 54-60, user inputs user identification, allows user to select an output image).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art to include user identification in the system of Nakajima and Yamakawa as evidenced by Kanno. Nakajima and Yamakawa teach user selection of a corrected preferred image and setting the select preference for other images. Kanno in the same field of endeavor identifies specific user of an output image, thus providing and maintaining the preference of a specific user of a system operated by many user (note col. 1 lines 61-66).

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory M. Desire whose telephone number is (703) 308-9586. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-6:00) Second Monday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bhavesh Mehta can be reached on (703) 308-5246. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Page 6

Application/Control Number: 09/819,731

Art Unit: 2625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gregory M. Desire Examiner Art Unit 2625

G.D. March 4, 2004

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800